

ing on fundamental industry programs of promotion, development, improvement, market development, and we want this Clause 23 (1) (d) broadened to be sure that things that are useful for the industry can be done by an agency outside the regulatory field.

All these statements referred to the bill tabled last year.

And the secretary of the Federation goes on to say:

Paragraph 40, page 21—there must be a power, we are advised, that specifically says that an agency may make regulations and orders—may make them; you have to actually say that. That is what we are advised, and it is not precisely said in the act.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole, the farmers, through their officials in various organizations, are informing us of their wishes. This legislation interests them but they request more details. The bill now before the House is a two-edged device. In order to avoid any misunderstanding and dangerous application of this legislation, I hope that the people who drafted it will take into consideration the remarks that were made before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which will be re-examining this bill.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) speaks now, he will close the debate.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal only briefly with some of the matters raised by hon. members who spoke in the debate on this bill. One of the concerns expressed by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) was that there would be a great deal of difficulty in attempting to regulate the supply of any particular agricultural commodity with respect to domestic producers unless we were to provide authority in the bill for a marketing agency to impose equal or perhaps even more severe regulation on importations into Canada of the same commodity.

In my view it is not a proper function of this Parliament or of the government to transfer automatically to any board that may be set up the right to impose duties or in fact erect non-tariff barriers with respect to international trade. There are a number of reasons for that. Of course one reason is that there are some international agreements to which Canada is party, which the government has an obligation to respect, and in doing so we have made certain commitments. One is that we will not impose restrictions, for the kind of purposes outlined in this bill, on imported goods if we do not apply the same restrictions on our domestic production. I am sure the hon. member for Kent-Essex is well aware of this principle.

I can also advise the hon. member, and I am sure this will relieve some of his anxiety with respect to the matter, that under these international agreements as I understand them, although there is some complexity about this, we can impose the same kind of supply management provisions on imports as are in fact applied to our domestic producers. That is the case with respect to some

#### *Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill*

of the international agreements. It seems to me that here is a balance which allows us, first of all, to take into account the interests of our domestic producers and also allows us to respect the international agreements we have made.

I am not suggesting that it will be easy to do this in all cases, because of course different points of view are taken from time to time depending on a country's own interests. However, I would like the hon. member to understand why it would not be possible to transfer automatically to a marketing agency, set up under this bill, the authority to deal with imports. It must remain the responsibility and prerogative of the government to change tariffs, or to change the impediments if you wish to call them that, to trade coming into Canada. I suggest that one can be made compatible with the other.

I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), even though he expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the remarks I made last night respecting the exclusion of beef, calves and beef products from this bill. I must say to him that as far as I can tell, although there is provision in existing provincial statutes to set up beef marketing boards, there are no beef marketing boards in existence and there is no agitation anywhere in the country to set up beef marketing boards.

What the hon. member says is true, that if the majority of beef producers in the country indicate to us, or to the council that will be set up under this legislation, that they wish to have a national beef marketing board or agency established, then the legislation would have to be amended. He is correct in that assumption, but I think he will respect the assertion I made that the exclusion of beef from the provisions of this bill at this time does not really do any damage to the immediate purposes we have in mind. When I say "immediate" this could mean extending over two, three, five years or more, because until and unless such time arrives as there are beef marketing agencies set up under provincial legislation then this enabling legislation, to co-ordinate the operation of those agencies, would not become operative.

I can understand the problem. I can tell the hon. member that in the province where I am producing beef, the producers some years ago demanded to be excluded from the statutory provisions under provincial law because they did not want any beef marketing board. But when they wanted a beef marketing commission so that they could make some levies for the purpose of promoting the sale of beef and that sort of thing, they went back to the provincial government of Alberta and asked to be included in the legislation so that they could do that.

It is valid to suggest that beef producers would want that kind of marketing commission all across the country, but there is no authority given under this bill to co-ordinate the activities of such commissions set up under provincial legislation, and to that extent the bill is a deterrent to having them set up on a national basis. But if this were desired by beef producers, they could seek a simple amendment to the act after it has been passed.